

Remarks

Claims 1-50 were pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 17, 24, 27, 36-40, 42, 44, 46, and 50 were rejected. Claims 5-7, 13-16, 18-23, 25, 26, 28-35, 41, 43, 45, and 47-49 were objected to. Claims 1, 10, 11, 17, and 24, are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12-16, 18-21, 25, 27, 28, 36, 40, 42, 44, 46, and 50 are amended. Claims 51-71 are added. Claims 2-9, 12-16, 18-23, and 26-71 are now pending in the application. Claims 5, 13-16, 18-21, 25, 28, 40, 42, 44, and 46 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the examiner objected to the use of the trademark/trade name Valco. Claim 24 is canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8-12, 17, 24, 27, 36-40, 42, 44, 46, and 50 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Bly. The Examiner also objected to claims 5-7, 13-16, 18-23, 25, 26, 28-35, 41, 43, 45, and 47-49 as depending from a rejected base claim, but acknowledged that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 10, 11, 17, and 24 are canceled.

Dependent claim 5 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 5 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 5 is allowable, as are claims 6 and 7, which depend from claim 5. The objection to claims 5-7, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Rejected dependent claims 2-4, 8, 9, 27, 36, and 50 are amended to depend from allowable claim 5. Claims 37-39 depend from claim 36. The rejection of claims 2-4, 8, 9, 27, 36-39, and 50, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 13 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10 and 11. Thus, claim 13 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 13 is allowable. Dependent claim 12 is amended to depend from allowable claim 13. The objection to claims 12 and 13, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 14 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10 and 11. Thus, claim 14 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 14 is allowable. The objection to claim 14, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 15 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claim 10. Thus, claim 15 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is allowable. The objection to claim 15, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 16 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10 and 11. Thus, claim 16 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 16 is allowable. The objection to claim 16, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 18 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10, 11, and 17. Thus, claim 18

is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 18 is allowable. The objection to claim 18, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 19 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10, 11, and 17. Thus, claim 19 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 19 is allowable. The objection to claim 19, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 20 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10, 11, and 17. Thus, claim 20 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 20 is allowable, as are claims 22 and 23, which depend from claim 20. The objection to claims 20, 22, and 23, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 21 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends, and of intervening claims 10, 11, and 17. Thus, claim 21 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 21 is allowable. The objection to claim 21, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 25 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 25 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 25 is allowable, as is claim 26, which depends from claim 25. The objection to claims 25 and 26, therefore, should be withdrawn. New claim 51 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 2. New claim 52 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 3. New claim 53 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 4. New claim 54 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 8. New claim 55 depends from claim 25 and

recites the features of claim 9. New claim 56 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 27. New claims 57-60 depend from claim 25 and recite the features of claims 36-39, respectively. New claims 61 and 62 depend from claim 25 and recite the features of claims 40 and 41, respectively. New claims 63 and 64 depend from claim 25 and recite the features of claims 42 and 43, respectively. New claims 65 and 66 depend from claim 25 and recite the features of claims 44 and 45, respectively. New claims 67-70 depend from claim 25 and recite the features of claims 46-49, respectively. New claim 71 depends from claim 25 and recites the features of claim 50. It is respectfully submitted that new dependent claims 51-71, all of which recite the subject matter of previously-presented dependent claims, depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable.

Dependent claim 28 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 28 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 28 is allowable, as are claims 29-35, which depend from claim 28. The objection to claims 28-35, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 40 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 40 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 40 is allowable, as is claim 41, which depends from claim 40. The objection to claims 40 and 41, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 42 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 42 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 42 is allowable, as is claim 43, which

depends from claim 42. The objection to claims 42 and 43, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 44 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 44 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 44 is allowable, as is claim 45, which depends from claim 44. The objection to claims 44 and 45, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 46 is amended to explicitly recite all the features of independent claim 1, from which it depends. Thus, claim 46 is amended in form only, and not in substance. It is therefore submitted that claim 46 is allowable, as are claims 47-49, which depend from claim 46. The objection to claims 46-49, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all objections and rejections have been overcome. It is therefore requested that the Amendment be entered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

March 11, 2005

Date

TMC:hlp



---

Thomas M. Champagne  
Registration No. 36,478  
IP STRATEGIES  
12 ½ Wall Street  
Suite I  
Asheville, North Carolina 28801  
828.253.8600  
828.253.8620 fax